

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a budget and regular meeting of the **Brown County Public Safety Committee** was held on Wednesday, October 4, 2017 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Buckley, Supervisor Clancy, Supervisor Evans, Supervisor Zima, Supervisor Nicholson
Also Present: Supervisor Sieber, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Brusky, Supervisor Gruszynski, Supervisor Vander Leest, Supervisor Moynihan, Medical Examiner Director of Operations Barry Irmien, Sheriff John Gossage, Chief Deputy Todd Delain, Accountant Donn Hein, Judge Zuidmulder, Emergency Management Director Jerad Preston, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Human Resource Director Kathryn Roellich, Finance Director Dave Ehlinger, District Attorney Dave Lasee, Public Safety Communications Director Cullen Peltier, County Executive Troy Streckenbach, Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery

**PLEASE NOTE: THESE MINUTES ARE FOR THE NON-BUDGET AGENDA ITEMS.
MINUTES FOR THE BUDGET PORTION OF THIS MEETING WILL ACCOMPANY THE
AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 1, 2017 BUDGET MEETING**

I. Call meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Buckley at 11:04 am.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of September 6, 2017.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

****NON-BUDGET ITEMS****

Comments from the Public on Non-Budget Items. None.

Circuit Court, Commissioners, Probate

1. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Zima to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Clerk of Courts

2. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

District Attorney

3. District Attorney's Report.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Public Safety Communications

4. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

5. Director's Report.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Zima to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Emergency Management

6. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

**Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Nicholson to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. Director's Report.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Medical Examiner

8. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

9. 2017 Medical Examiner Activity Spreadsheet.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

10. Medical Examiner's Report.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Sheriff

11. Budget Status Financial Report for August 2017.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

12. Update on Jail Addition – *Standing item.*

Sheriff John Gossage indicated the jail representative was unable to attend this meeting and asked that this matter be held.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to hold until next meeting. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

13. Sheriff's Report.

**Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Communications

14. **Communication from Supervisors Sieber/Linssen/Becker: To include in the 2018 budget up to \$150,000 to RFP for services to find efficiencies in our criminal justice system. *Referred from September County Board.***

Supervisor Sieber addressed the Committee and indicated this communication is quite similar to Chair Buckley's communication at Item 16.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to take Items 14 & 16 together. Vote taken.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Sieber continued that from prior discussions it is evident there are some inefficiencies and bottlenecks in the criminal justice system. He was pleased with the motion during the budget portion of the meeting to add three more DAs to help clear the bottleneck. He said there appears to be several places where inefficiencies exist and in talking with people involved in each department, other counties and people that come through the system there are a number of ways to find more efficiency within the system to try to keep the jail population down. The Sheriff seems to be the bottom of the hill and everything seems to roll there, but it is not just the Sheriff's Department or the jail, it is the entire system.

Sieber has talked to other counties who have been very successful in hiring consultants to look at their systems. There are consultants that can come in and look at the entire system and then make recommendations as to where the system can become more efficient and Sieber feels something like that is needed here. There are companies that specialize in this and he along with some other supervisors would like to go through the RFP process and then a decision can be made based on experience and credentials. He referenced Buckley's communication to have Internal Auditor Dan Process conduct an audit, and he feels Process is very capable and competent and is right on top of things, but he feels having someone with experience in this particular type of work would be beneficial. Sieber knows of a consulting company that other counties have used and he can provide that information. Another county that used the firm had declining jail population after working with the consulting firm and was able to put off building a new jail. Obviously the RFP process would allow the County to look at a number of firms that would then be judged on credentials, experience and past success.

Buckley said his thought when he put his communication in was to have the Internal Auditor start to look at the processes to narrow down the scope of what we are trying to accomplish. Process said one of his concerns is that he may not have the expertise that would be needed to look at the judicial system. He thought something like flowcharting the process may be useful in trying to find the bottlenecks and issues and then work could be done to come up with recommendations.

Supervisor Zima noted there have been studies done in other counties and he feels it may be beneficial to review results of those studies to pick up some clues that could alleviate us having to go through a big study ourselves. Zima referenced the Mental Health Ad Hoc Committee which includes a lot of the principal players of the criminal justice system and this has helped figure out ways to solve some of the problems. He feels a lot of this is commonsense and the key players like jail staff, the DA and the Sheriff know where the inefficiencies and bottlenecks are. Zima continued that if there are real tangibles that came out of studies in other counties we should try to benefit from that and let the key players here work on this. He does not want to see a lot of money spent on a study that just ends up sitting on a shelf and he feels we should ask staff to try to get results of similar studies and report back. If that brings more questions, then a study may be necessary here. Zima asked how Sieber came up with the estimate of \$150,000 to do the study and Sieber responded it was based on what another county paid for a similar study a few years ago. He said that this is being brought forward now during budget time to be included in the budget or to have money set aside for it in the future in case it is needed. He feels that having Process compile the reports from other counties is a good idea.

Zima said the County has good personnel and leadership in the criminal justice system and they are bringing things forward. It should not be hard to figure out where the backlogs are and what can be done to handle them, but it seems like the State is not keeping up their responsibilities. The question is if the County needs to bite the bullet because it is advantageous to us by saving money in the long run, even though it is the State's responsibility. Sieber added that sometimes day to day operations bog things down and do not allow a lot of time to go out and look at other options. He said the consultant he mentioned earlier has done numerous studies nationwide. He is also aware

that other counties in Wisconsin have had studies done and were able to avoid adding jail space. Zima said Process should work on getting studies together and then summarize them and provide a report to this Committee. A decision can then be made as to whether we need our own study.

District Attorney Dave Lasee said a system map was done in 2014 with some TAD funding that was leftover. A national consultant did the mapping and a lot of the key players participated in the process. One of the issues that has been struggled with is doing the follow up. Some of the things from the system map were implemented, but there were some other things that were not. Some of the inefficiencies and bottlenecks were identified and the map was forwarded around and not much was done after that. The map from the national consulting firm can be used as a starting point.

Buckley said the map Lasee talked about may give Process a good start in flowcharting this. This could lead to more of a directed point. The information we need may already be out there, and what we need is someone to compile it and bring it forward. Buckley also feels the County needs a grant writer to help find funding for some of the things the County is doing, like the treatment courts and other programs. Buckley said if we do need to take money from the general fund for a study down the road, we can do that. Sieber reiterated that he brought this forward at this time because it is budget time and now would be the time to attach funds for a study. Zima cautioned spending money on a study if there are not dollars available to implement any suggested changes.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to open the floor to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Robert Srenaski, 3375 Sonata Drive, Green Bay, WI

Srenaski is a citizen representative on the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board. He said the mapping referenced by DA Lasee produced six pages of information, but what it did not do is establish average timelines for each of the steps. Follow up should be done to assign times for each step of the process because by doing that, the bottlenecks can be identified. The problem seems to be the excessive amount of time people are staying in the jail which is a process problem. Once ideal timelines are established, a comparison can be made as to what is actually happening versus what the timeline should be. After that, continuous improvement goals can be established and actions that are necessary to accomplish the goals determined. Srenaski said if the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board is tasked with assigning timelines, we can start to utilize some internal sources. He feels that would be the most effective next step.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Buckley would like to keep the ball rolling on this and would like to see this referred back to staff. Sieber said he would be agreeable to that, but he would still like to see the option for an RFP for a study. Referring this to staff would allow Process to gather the existing studies and look at the process mapping. Supervisor Evans did not feel we should be sending this to Process to determine where the bottleneck is. Evans noted Process is an accountant and he does not feel it is appropriate to give our employees a task that is outside of the realm of their expertise or scope and function of their job. Process said he mentioned he does not have expertise in the criminal justice system, but he would be able to look at the system mapping that has already been done. Evans said he would not support a motion to refer this to the Internal Auditor to determine the bottlenecks, but he does not object to forwarding it to him to look into what organizations do this process or what has been done in other areas and report back. He noted that all of the key players are on the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board and there was good conversation on this at the last meeting. Buckley said the DA already has the system mapping and he did not see how asking Process to go talk to department heads on this is much different than sending him to the Highway Department to look at efficiencies.

Sieber feels this is really a two-part issue. First, he feels Process would probably be comfortable handling what Zima suggested which was to compile studies that had been done within the State and report on what the findings were. The second part would be to take this to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board to find out if they feel they have a good grasp on the issues going forward and find out what they need to get everything together in one map. He wants to see things keep moving forward in finding efficiencies and if the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board thinks they are on the right track, that is great. If they feel they would benefit from a consultant coming in and identifying the problems and giving ideas as to how to coordinate better and see what technology or advancements are out there, then he would probably follow that recommendation.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to refer to staff. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

15. **Communication from Supervisors Buckley and Chairman Moynihan: We, the undersigned Brown County Board Supervisors, hereby request that the Brown County Board of Supervisors classify Brown County Corrections Officers as protective status employees (Employee Trust Fund) but not that of a bargaining unit. We make this request due to the alarming amount of correction officers' resignations over a seven year period (61). It is not to suggest that protective status alone will maintain staffing levels, however, it may enhance the morale of those who presently serve as well as future recruitment. With pending jail pod expansion and with it presumably increased staffing, we believe that the protective status action is a prudent decision. We respectfully ask for your consideration. *Referred from September County Board.***

Supervisor Moynihan said this communication speaks for itself. At the time Act 10 was enacted, it seemed to be intimated that there was no choice but to remove the protective status from the correction officers, but looking back at this now, it seems to have been the wrong move. He feels the right thing to do is give the correction officers the protective status, but he does not want to create a bargaining unit. Moynihan continued that there has been sizable resignation of correction officers and he feels that giving them protective status would be something that perspective employees would like to know is there, especially when they get closer to retirement age. Moynihan continued that the correction officers have a thankless job and the protective status element would be something favorable for them, especially when they are approaching retirement. He also feels the Sheriff would like to see protective status restored, but not a bargaining unit. He noted there is currently some legislation on this in Madison.

Supervisor Clancy mentioned that another factor in this is the cost of training correction officers who then leave the County's employment. Moynihan agreed and said two correction trainers have recently left, partly due to the revolving door of correction officers.

In responding to Clancy's comment, Sheriff Gossage said it costs \$20,000 - \$25,000 per person when employment is separated. That includes costs of training and backfill and overtime. He said 20 correction staff have left in 2017 and at a cost of \$20,000 - \$25,000 each, the total cost is about a half million dollars. Gossage said he informed former HR Director Miller as well as the County Executive not to bite off their nose to spite their face because there would be a mass exodus of correction officers and that is what has happened.

Moynihan said if protective status is provided to employees, some say they automatically become a bargaining unit, but the other side says that is not the case. He feels it would be appropriate to get an opinion from the Attorney General instead of waiting for the legislature. He wants the employees to know that the Board has concerns and is looking at this.

Supervisor Nicholson said he did not support taking the protective status away a couple years ago because he knew this was going to happen. He feels people would not want to work in Brown County with no protective status when they can work somewhere else that has protective status. He feels taking away the protective status was a mistake and he would like to move forward with getting the protective status back. He questioned if we need to go to the Attorney General or if Corporation Counsel could provide an opinion. Moynihan reiterated that he wants to provide the protective status, but he does not want to create a bargaining unit. He wants to be proactive and said taking the protective status away was a collective mistake.

Motion made by Supervisor Nicholson to get an Attorney General opinion to see if we have to provide a bargaining unit if we provide protective status. *No second, no action taken.*

Zima recalled the retirement fund told us they did not care about this one way or another and if the County said the correction officers were allowed to participate in the system they would not question it. Moynihan said there was a resolution in May, 2015 in support of going back to protective status, but we are still waiting on that. That resolution was sent to the WCA, our State representatives and the Sheriff's Association but no response has been received to date.

Zima asked what is stopping us from going back to protective status. Moynihan responded the argument is that going back to protective status would automatically create a bargaining unit. That is why he feels we need an opinion from

the Attorney General. Zima considers this a no brainer for the legislature and yet it could not get any traction. He has heard different reasons for this, so nobody really got interested in it which he does not understand since this is budget neutral.

Gossage confirmed there is no fiscal impact to the State. There were some questions on ETF and how to administer some of the minutia that got added to the legislation. It is his understanding that this is going to committee in October with no ties to collective bargaining.

Buckley said if we are going to restore the protective status, we need a fiscal impact. Gossage said in 2015 the estimate was \$287,000, not including overtime. Moynihan said it may be too early to start throwing figures around. When he created the communication, he did not know this was going to be brought up at committee by the fall. Before we spend additional dollars, he feels we should see what happens at committee, but we can still go forward with getting an Attorney General opinion.

Buckley feels we have to act on this. Zima feels money should be put in the budget for this and asked again what amount we are looking at. Director of Administration Chad Weininger said the amount in 2015 was \$287,000, not including overtime. Zima did not think this should cause any additional overtime. Finance Director Dave Ehlinger said the calculations were made at straight time, but the officers do work overtime. Zima said they are working overtime now because of a lot of vacancies. Weininger responded that due to the way they are scheduled there is automatically overtime. Zima would like to solve this problem sooner rather than later and did not think the Attorney General's opinion is worth most other opinions.

Buckley asked County Executive Troy Streckenbach for his viewpoint. Streckenbach recalled when this was debated a few years ago, the demands from the group was they wanted back payment for retirement and their health insurance back and the Board decided to go in a different direction and passed a resolution stating they still wanted the correction officers to have protective status but not with the bargaining. What is being done at the State is advocating for protective status and he said the WCA clearly states they want them to be able to opt in to have protective status but not have bargaining rights. WCA is supportive of the resolution passed by the Board that states they want to have the ability to opt in for protective status but without the bargaining rights and are advocating for this at the State. Brown County has joined in a multi-county litigation in terms of the definition of law enforcement; the courts ruled that jailers do not meet the criteria that falls under protective status. Zima said in the past the Board has done things to solve problems, and this is a problem that needs to be solved. He spoke with ETF and was advised that if the County says the jailers fall under protective status, they would not have any problem with that and would not question it and based on that, Zima questions why we cannot give them the benefit. Streckenbach reiterated that Brown County entered into litigation with a number of other counties regarding the definition which states that by ETF standards jailers do not meet the protective status requirements. The Badger State Sheriff's Association, along with the WCA and other sponsors have been trying to find a reasonable solution to get to the point where the County can provide for protective status without the bargaining aspect. If the policy of the County Board is to do something else, we would have to assess what that is. Streckenbach's objective is to get past the hurdles and move the legislation forward. It is his understanding that the ETF feels comfortable with the way the language is arranged.

Zima asked if all County employees are enrolled in ETF. Gossage responded that all general municipal employees as defined under Chapter 41 are enrolled in ETF, including the jailers. However, the jailers do not fall into the protective status which gives them early retirement and duty disability if they are injured in the line of duty which is a key component because they deal with a degree of danger and peril in their jobs. Jailers used to have protective status but it was taken away after Act 10. Streckenbach said the Board took the protective status away and Gossage said that decision was made on a recommendation that said it was illegal for counties to classify those employees as protective status because Chapter 41 does not recognize them. The current legislation is to include correction officers in Chapter 41 as protective status which would allow the counties to make the specific decision.

Buckley said the communication was put in because they want the protective status, but they want to make sure it does not affect them being able to organize. He asked if an Attorney General opinion would suffice on this if the legislature does not do their job. Corporation Counsel Dave Hemery said if someone is a protective service employee, they have the right to collectively bargain so the question is if individuals are corrective service employees. If you are a deputy sheriff and a protective occupant participant (POP), then you can collectively bargain. There is a case from 2013 that has the weight of the law behind it and in that case the issue of protective status was not the issue. The

issue was are they deputy sheriffs. In the 2013 case the court said if the Sheriff's Office employs them and if they are primarily telephone operators, clerks, stenographs or other things like that, then they are deemed to be deputy sheriffs. That case specifically found the deputation has nothing to do with it. Basically, to meet the first part of the test, if you are an employee of the Sheriff's Department and you are not specifically a clerk or someone who answers the phones, you are considered a deputy for these purposes. Once it is determined that someone has POP status, they would be able to collectively bargain. To collectively bargain, a person has to be a deputy sheriff and have POP status.

Hemery continued that the issue with the group we are talking about now is if they meet the POP criteria. There are three main requirements that have to be met and they are as follows 1) are they primarily engaged in law enforcement activities, meaning they carry out law enforcement type duties more than 50% of the time; 2) does the job of jailers involve frequent exposure to a high degree of danger or peril; and 3) do their job duties require a high degree of physical condition. Hemery said should this get to the County Board floor, he would suggest the Board look at each of these factors and analyze whether or not jailers meet the criteria. If the Board feels in good faith that the three criteria are met, the jailers should be POP participants. All three criteria are necessary to designate them as POP.

Nicholson said what Moynihan is asking for is protective status without bargaining authority. Hemery said his opinion is that if you designate a deputy sheriff as a POP participant, they would have collective bargaining authority. The two criteria are they need to be both deputy sheriffs and POP participants. Hemery said there is a good body of authority on this and although it is not court authority, it is an ETF determination. As far as ETF and other State agencies, they pretty much do not challenge a County's decisions, although Hemery noted they would have the right to appeal the decision.

Zima asked Moynihan if he was in favor of the corrections officers being classified as protective status. Moynihan reiterated that he wanted to give them the status, but does not want to create a bargaining unit. He said it is Hemery's opinion that if the corrections officers are designated as protective status, they automatically become a bargaining unit. His communication is to give them the status, but not the creation of a bargaining unit. Moynihan said if the pending legislation is passed, this becomes moot, but it would be nice to know one way or another.

Hemery said there is certain criteria that has to be met before the Attorney General will issue an opinion. One such requirement is that Hemery has researched this and looked at it and his opinion is open or is a gray area. Hemery feels the question we are asking was answered in the 2013 case and accordingly he would have a hard time submitting this to the Attorney General.

Buckley said if we are not going to go to the Attorney General for an opinion, we will probably have to wait for the pending legislation and that could take forever. Hemery said his understanding of the legislation is that it would give the correction officers POP status without giving them collective bargaining rights. Moynihan said there is no fiscal impact for asking the Attorney General for an opinion. He said the other option would be to hold this until the legislature acts on the legislation. Gossage said there is hope there will be a public hearing in October and he plans to go to testify and he believes Streckenbach plans to testify as well. Buckley asked if we should look at allocating money in the 2018 budget for this if it goes through. Moynihan said this is paramount for these correction employees. The turnover may not necessarily be due to the protective status aspect, but from a peace of mind standpoint, the officers would have the ability to retire a little healthier and a little sooner than before. He does not have a problem spending for this, but it may end up being moot and he does not want to add dollars to the budget if it is all for naught. He said this really comes down to the will of the Board. Buckley said he would prefer to have the money appropriated with the worst case scenario being that we do not use it.

Clancy asked Hemery if a proposal could be made that we fund the protective status until the court stops it. A resolution could state that this is for the welfare and good of this specific group of people. Hemery responded the POP status would change several things if it is awarded. One thing is the percentage of the retirement contribution that the employer puts in and the employee puts in. Less money is put in for regular employees because they have to wait longer to retire, but for POP participants, a larger amount is put in because they retire at an earlier age. Clancy said he wants to give them the designation of POP, but not the bargaining rights. Hemery said his opinion is that once the correction officers are designated as POPs, they have everything they need to collectively bargain, but he noted it would be their decision because they would have to certify as a union.

Hemery continued that an ETF agent reports to the Employee Trust Fund Department the status of employees. Currently the ETF agent reports these employees as general municipal employees. If the Board were to make a determination that they are POPs, the ETF agent would have a duty to report that to ETF and that would trigger everything. He said the Board could decide to give the correction officers a significant raise that may address some of the monetary issues but not have anything to do with status. He feels what the correction officers are looking for is the right to retire earlier, given the strenuous nature of the job. Hemery said you cannot have it both ways; if the Board wants to compensate them, that can be done, but if they want to say they are POP participants, the ETF agent would have a duty to report that and then they could bargain.

Moynihan said if we set aside the dollars for correction officers, there could be a motion to reconsider the additional dollars for the three DAs that were added earlier in the budget portion of this meeting. He noted the DAs were added without any study. He agreed there is a need for more DAs, but said there would also be other things associated with that such as staff, space and jail implications.

Weininger said the levy limit is \$829,000 and we are down to \$572,000 with the proposals made earlier in the meeting. He said not setting aside dollars for this would be creating a larger structural deficit for next year. Buckley feels we should appropriate money this year and if we end up not using it, the funds can be used elsewhere. He agreed with Weininger that if we do not earmark money for this and then it goes through, it will create a bigger issue. Moynihan noted that although this Committee believes it is the right thing to do, the rest of the Board would also need to agree. He also noted this whole discussion would be moot if the legislation passes which would give correction officers protective status without creating a bargaining unit which is what his communication is seeking. Buckley would like to see a resolution to earmark money for this in the 2018 budget so that if the legislation is approved, it is funded. Weininger said the appropriate procedure would be to increase the levy at the Executive Committee and then put the money in general revenues where it would be held and then if it was not used, it would lapse. This would prevent a shortfall going into 2019. Buckley asked if it would be better to have a motion come out of this Committee at this time. Weininger said he would prefer a motion from this Committee but said the Sheriff's budget should be reconsidered at the same time to earmark money in general revenues for that.

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to reconsider the Sheriff's Department budget. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to set aside \$300,000 in general revenue for corrections officers' increase for protective service status based on state legislation. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to approve the Sheriff's Department budget as amended. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

16. **Communication from Public Safety Chairman Pat Buckley: To have the Internal Auditor conduct a time study of the judicial process encompassing Sheriff's Office, the District Attorney and the Courts.**

Although shown in the proper format here, this Item was taken together with Item 14.

17. **Review Minutes of:**
- a. **Fire Investigation Task Force General Membership (June 1, 2017).**
 - b. **Local Emergency Planning Committee – LEPC (July 11, 2017).**
 - c. **Traffic Safety Commission (July 11, 2017).**
 - d. **Criminal Justice Coordinating Board (September 28, 2017).**

Motion made by Supervisor Zima, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to combine Items 17 a – d and receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

18. **Criminal Justice Coordinating Board Information Update – Judge Zuidmulder.**

Although shown in the proper format here, Judge Zuidmulder addressed the Committee during Item 1 of the budget portion of this meeting.

Other

19. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to pay the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

20. Such other matters as authorized by law. None.

21. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Clancy to adjourn at 2:29 pm. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary